LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

JUL 26 1967

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

NO. 423

ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, et al, Petitioners

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

VINCENT M. CASEY, ESQ.
720 Grant Bldg.
Pittsburgh, Penna., 15219

SMITH BROS. CO. INC., LAW PRINTERS, 620 SECOND AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, PA. 15219

INDEX

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 2

Questions Presented 2

Constitutional, Statutory and Procedural Rules Provisions Involved 2

Statement of the Case 4

Reasons for Granting the Writ 6

Conclusion 8

Certificate of Service 8

Appendix A—Opinion of Lower Court 9

Appendix B—Judgment Below 17

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Cross v. U. S. (D.C. Cir.) 335 F.2d 989..... 6

Ingram v. U. S. (4th Cir.) 272 F.2d 567..... 6

King v. U. S. (1st Cir.) 355 F.2d 700..... 6

Metheany v. U. S. (9th Cir.) 365 F.2d 90..... 6

McElroy v. U. S. 164 U.S., 76, 17 S. Ct. Rep. 31.... 2, 7

U. S. v. Spector, (7th Cir.) 326 F. 2d 345..... 6

Ward v. U. S. (D.C. Cir.) 289 F.2d 877..... 6

Statues Cited

Title 18 U.S.C.A. 371..... 2

Title 18 U.S.C.A. 495..... 3

Rules of Criminal Procedure

Rule 8(b) 3

Rule 14 3

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

NO. ....

ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirming the judgment of the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania which had sentenced petitioner for three separate conspiracies (distinct in time and place) to forge and utter stolen United States securities and for eighteen separate counts for substantive offenses involving the forging and uttering of certain stolen securities.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the District Court its opinion is not yet reported but is included as Appendix C. The opinion of the District Court is not reported. It is reproduced in Appendix "A" to this petition.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on June 30, 1967. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1) and Rule 22(2).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Should not this Court take jurisdiction when the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in an important matter of defendants' right in criminal cases is in direct conflict with the decisions of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the Seventh, Fourth, Ninth and First Circuits?

2. Should not this Court take jurisdiction when the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has decided that petitioner can be compelled to stand trial on three separate, distinct and unconnected conspiracies and the separate, distinct and unconnected substantive counts, the object of each conspiracy, when such decision is in direct conflict with this court's decision in *McElroy v. U. S.*, 164 U.S. 76, 17 S.Ct. Rep. 31?

CONSTITUTIONAL, STATUTORY AND PROCEDURAL RULES PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. General Conspiracy Statute, 18 U.S.C. 371:

"If two or more persons conspire * * * to commit any offense against the United States * * * and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000.00 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Procedural Rules Involved.

2. The Certificate Forgery Statute, 18 U.S.C. 495:

"Whoever falsely makes, alters, forges, or counterfeits any * * * certificate * * * for the purpose of obtaining or receiving * * * from the United States * * * any sum of money; whoever utters * * * any such * * * forged writing, with intent to defraud the United States, shall be fined not more than $1,000.00 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

3. Rule 8(b) Rules of Criminal Procedure:

"(b) Joinder of Defendants. Two or more defendants may be charged in the same indictment or information if they are alleged to have participated in the same act or transaction or in the same series of acts or transactions constituting an offense or offenses. Such defendants may be charged in one or more counts together or separately and all of the defendants need not be charged in each count."

4. Rule 14 Rules of Criminal Procedure:

"Relief from Prejudicial Joinder

"If it appears that a defendant or the government is prejudiced by a joinder of offenses or of defendants in an indictment or information or by such joinder for trial together, the court may order an election or separate trials of counts, grant a severance of defendants or provide whatever other relief justice requires."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The 23rd Count of the Indictment charged the petitioner Nightingale, Horovitz, Stringi and Simon, with a conspiracy to violate Section 495 of Title 18 U.S.C., by forging the endorsement of the registered owner Hammond on 28 stolen United States Savings Bonds and by uttering same. This count charged that the conspiracy began on February 26, 1963, and the offense occurred at Berlin, Somerset County, and Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

The 1st Count in the Indictment charged petitioner Nightingale, Stringi and Horovitz with the forging of a particular one of said 28 bonds on February 26, 1963. The 2nd Count charged the petitioner Nightingale, Stringi and Horovitz with the uttering of said bond on February 26, 1963. The 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th Counts charged petitioner Nightingale, Stringi and Horovitz with the forging and uttering of two other stolen bonds.

The 24th Count was a conspiracy count charging the petitioner Nightingale, Cochran, Stringi and Simon with conspiracy to violate Section 495 of Title 18 U.S.C. This conspiracy was laid on March 28, 1963, and was alleged to have occurred at Berlin, Somerset County, and Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. It was alleged that the conspirators agreed to forge the endorsement of the registered owner Stofcheck to 81 United States Savings Bonds and to utter same.

The 7th Count charged that the petitioner Nightingale, Stringi and Cochran on the 28th of March, 1963, at Berlin, Somerset County, Pennsylvania, forged one of the 81 stolen bonds.

The 8th Count charged the petitioner Nightingale, Stringi and Cochran with uttering said stolen bond.

The 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th Counts charged the said Nightingale, Stringi and Cochran with the uttering and forging of two other specific bonds of the said 81 stolen bonds.

The 25th Count charged the petitioner Nightingale and Stringi with a conspiracy to violate Section 495 of Title 18 in that on May 10, 1963, at Somerset, Somerset County, and Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, said conspirators forged the endorsement of Stellitano, the registered owner of 348 United States Savings Bonds, and uttered same.

The 13th Count charged the petitioner Nightingale and Stringi with the forging of one of the said Stellitano bonds on May 10, 1963, at Somerset, Somerset County, Pennsylvania.

The 14th Count charged the uttering of said Stellitano bond on May 10, 1963.

The 15th, 16th, 17th and 18th Counts charged the petitioner Nightingale and Stringi with the forging and uttering of two other of the stolen Stellitano bonds.

The Government did not contend that the defendants stole the bonds.

The petitioner Nightingale, both before and during the trial, moved the Court, pursuant to the Criminal Rules, for a severance, and also moved the Court to require the United States Attorney to elect which of the conspiracies, with the attendant substantive counts it would try. These motions were denied by the trial judge and the trial resulted in a verdict of guilty on all counts.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

It is clear that the petitioner's liberty is at stake as are the liberties of many multiple defendants who are obliged to stand trial with other defendants and meet charges of other unrelated and distinct crimes. It was unfair to petitioner to require him to defend in one trial the three conspiracies and the eighteen separate charges of forging and uttering. The counts were distinct and several offenses, not parts of the same transaction but independent, and not provable by the same evidence. It is of great importance in the administration of criminal justice generally that the procedure be settled so that there be uniformity in the District Courts for the trial of multiple defendants on multiple count indictments. It is particularly important that the law be settled as to whether or not three separate conspiracies involving separate acts and transactions and in no way connected, involving different defendants, can be tried at one and the same trial.

The decision of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in petitioner's case is in direct conflict with the following Court of Appeals decisions of other circuits:

U. S. v. Spector, (7th Cir.), 326 F.2d 345;

Ingram v. U. S., (4th Cir.), 272 F.2d 567;

Metheany v. U. S., (9th Cir.), 365 F.2d 90;

Ward v. U. S., (District of Columbia Cir.), 289 F.2d 877;

King v. U. S., (1st Cir.), 355 F.2d 700;

Cross v. U. S., (District of Columbia Cir.), 335 F.2d 989.

Therefore it is of great importance that this Court declare the uniform law with respect to the Federal Law relating to single trials of multiple defendants charged with multiple counts.

The decision of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals is directly in conflict with the decision of this Court decided many years ago where the Supreme Court of the United States decided this question squarely opposite to that reached by the Third Circuit Court in the case of *McElroy et al. v. U. S.*, 164 U.S. 76, 17 S. Ct. Rep. 31. McElroy is indistinguishable from the present case.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

VINCENT M. CASEY
Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I served five (5) copies of the foregoing Petition upon the Solicitor General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington 25, D.C., by placing them in the United States Mail addressed to him.

Attorney for Petitioner

APPENDIX "A"

Opinion.

(Filed April 5, 1966.)

ROSENBERG, *District Judge*

The defendants, Frank Stringi, Ernest Nightingale and Charlann M. Simon, have filed motions for Judgment of Acquittal, New Trial and Arrest of Judgment following their convictions by a Federal jury. Their contentions were previously considered and rejected before and during their trial. After reconsideration of their contentions, it is my opinion that the defendants' motion should be denied.

The evidence presented by the Government can be briefly summarized. On February 26, 1963, defendant Frank Stringi, accompanied by defendants Joseph Horowitz and Charlann M. Simon, proceeded from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to Berlin, Pennsylvania, where they met with the defendant, Ernest Nightingale, a director of the First National Bank of Berlin. After discussion, it was arranged that Horovitz would pose as Walter Hammond, the registered co-owner of a quantity of the United States Savings Bonds which had previously been stolen from another co-owner. The four defendants entered the First National Bank of Berlin where Nightingale, in the presence and within the hearing of Stringi and Simon, introduced Horovitz to bank officials as Walter Hammond. Each defendant knew the true identity of Horovitz. After the false identification of Horovitz, Horovitz proceeded to forge the endorsement of Walter Hammond to twenty-eight (28) $1,000

United States Savings Bonds. The bonds were negotiated and the proceeds distributed.

On March 18, 1963, Elvin E. Cochran, whose true identity was well known by the defendants Stringi and Simon, was driven to Berlin, Pennsylvania, by Simon at Stringi's direction. In route Simon delivered to Cochran eighty-one (81) United States Savings Bonds registered in the name of Albert Earl Stofcheck. These bonds, like the Hammond bonds, had been stolen from the true owner. Simon had received these bonds from Stringi. Upon the arrival of Cochran and Simon they were met by Nightingale, who accompanied them to the First National Bank of Berlin. Nightingale introduced Cochran to the bank officials as Albert E. Stofcheck, well knowing his true name to be Elvin (Red) Cochrane. Cochran then forged the name of Mr. Stofcheck to eighty-one (81) United States Savings Bonds and negotiated these bonds for the sum of $9,409.37. A portion of this money was received in cash by the defendant Nightingale, part was placed in a joint account opened in the names of Nightingale and Stringi, and $5,409.37 was received in the form of a Cashier's check, payable to Ernest Nightingale. This check was endorsed by Nightingale, and given to Miss Simon who subsequently delivered it to Stringi.

On May 9, 1963, the defendant Stringi instructed Joseph Vento, an employee, to go to Somerset, Pennsylvania, to meet Ernest Nightingale. Nightingale, who in the past had met Joseph Vento and knew him by his true name, introduced Vento at the Cambria Savings and Loan Association, Somerset, Pennsylvania, as Annunzio Stellitano. Vento signed Stellitano's name to three hundred forty-seven (347) United States Savings

Bonds having a redemption value of $8,186.01. The Stellitano bonds had previously been stolen from the true owner. After the signing of the bonds, they were negotiated and the proceeds distributed.

In Counts 1 through 7 of the indictment, the defendants Stringi, Nightingale and Horovitz were charged with the substantive offenses of forging and uttering the Hammond bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 495.[1] In Count 23, the defendants Stringi, Nightingale, Horovitz and Simon were charged with conspiracy to forge and utter the Hammond bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371.[2] Prior to trial, the defendant Horovitz pleaded

---

1. "Whoever falsely makes, alters, forges, or counterfeits any deed, power of attorney, order certificate, receipt, contract, or other writing, for the purpose of obtaining or receiving, or of enabling any other person, either directly or indirectly, to obtain or receive from the United States or any officers or agents thereof, any sum of money; or

Whoever utters or publishes as true any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited writing, with intent to defraud the United States, knowing the same to be false, altered, forged, or counterfeited; or

Whoever transmits to, or presents at any office or officer of the United States, any such writing in support of, or in relation to, any account or claim, with intent to defraud the United States, knowing the same to be false, altered, forged or counterfeited—

Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

2. "If two or more persons, conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

guilty to some of these counts and appeared as a Government witness against his co-defendants.

In Counts 8 through 12, the defendants Stringi, Nightingale and Cochran were charged with the substantive offenses of forging and uttering the Stofcheck bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 495. In Count 24, the defendants Stringi, Nightingale, Simon and Cochran were charged with conspiracy to forge and utter the Stofcheck bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371. Prior to trial, Cochran changed his plea to guilty as to some of these counts and testified as a Government witness against his co-defendants.

In Counts 13 through 18, the defendants Stringi and Nightingale were charged with the substantive offenses of forging and uttering the Stellitano bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 495. In Count 25 the defendants Stringi and Nightingale were charged with conspiring to forge and utter the Stellitano bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371. In Counts 19 through 22, the defendants Stringi and Nightingale were charged with false personation in connection with negotiation of certain bearer bonds. I dismissed these charges during the trial.

On December 14, 1964, the jury returned verdicts of guilty as to defendants Stringi, Nightingale and Simon as to each count in which the defendants were charged with the exception of Counts 19 through 22 which had already been dismissed.

The major point raised by the defendant is that the Court erred in refusing to sever the counts against the defendants and require separate trials as to each of the

involved transactions. Their contention is based on the premise that the Hammond, Stofcheck and Stellitano transactions were different and unrelated. However, in my opinion, these transactions fell within the provisions of Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which permits joinder where the multiple offenses "are of the same or similar character" or "are based on the same act or transaction or on two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or plan"; nor need all of the defendants "be charged in each count." Matthews v. United States (C.A. D.C., 1963), 319 F. 2d 740; Williamson v. United States (C.A. 9, 1962), 310 F. 2d 192; Pummill v. United States (C.A. 8, 1961), 297 F. 2d 34. The defendants attempt to make much of the fact that I granted separate trials to defendants Horovitz and Cochran. This relief was under Rule 14 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which provides for judicial discretion to order a severance of counts or defendants in the interests of justice. Counsel for the United States and for the defendants Horovitz and Cochran brought to my attention at the time of presenting motions for severance that these cases would most likely be disposed of by pleas of guilty. This is actually what happened: subsequent to the severance, both these defendants pleaded guilty and testified at the trial of their co-defendants. However, as to Stringi, Nightingale and Simon, no compelling reason appeared to command a similar exercise of discretion. In my opinion, none of the defendants were unfairly prejudiced before the jury by a joint trial.

The defendants Stringi and Simon contend that the indictment is defective because the term "other writ-

ings" in Title 18 U.S.C. § 495 does not include United States Government Savings bonds. They contend that the indictment should have been under 18 U.S.C. § 471,[3] a statute which refers specifically to government obligations. However, the instant case involves forged endorsements on the back of the bonds. Under the appropriate law, it appears that forged endorsements constitute "other writings" under § 495 but may not be the basis of prosecution under § 471. Cf. Prussian v. United States, 282 U.S. 675 (1931); United States v. Henderson, 298 F. 2d 522, 526, C.A. 7, 1962, cert. den. 369 U.S. 878.[4]

The defendant Charlann Simon, contends that the evidence as to her was insufficient. While the evidence may not demonstrate that she was a major violator in this scheme, there is sufficient evidence to permit a finding that she was engaged in criminal conspiracies. United States v. Mullins, 325 F. 2d 145, C.A. 2, 1963;

---

3. "Whoever, with intent to defraud, falsely makes, forges, counterfeits, or alters any obligation or other security of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than fifteen years, or both."

4. While it does not differentiate between § 495 and § 471, a similar case involving stolen bonds supported conviction on § 495. United States v. Campisi, 306 F. 2d 308, C.A. 2, 1962, cert. den. 371 U.S. 920, 925, 959, 83 S. Ct. 287, 293, 500, 9 L. Ed. 2d 229, 233, 507, rehearing den. 371 U.S. 959, 83 S. Ct. 502, 9 L. Ed. 2d 507. Prosecutions involving government checks are also based on § 495. Walker v. United States, 342 F. 2d 22, C.A. 5, 1965; Leonard v. United States, 324 F. 2d 911, C.A. 9, 1963; Kitchens v. United States, 272 F. 2d 757, C.A. 10, 1959, cert. den. 362 U.S. 946, 80 S. Ct. 809, 4 L. Ed. 2d 772; Hoffman v. United States, 244 F. 2d 378, C.A. 9, 1957.

United States v. Carlucci, 288 F. 2d 691, C.A. 3, 1961, cert. den. 366 U.S. 961; United States v. Migliorino, 238 F.2d 7, C.A. 3, 1956.

In Migliorino, Judge Staley said:

"Inasmuch as this case contains direct evidence that Migliorino was present while the criminal scheme was being formed, it goes far beyond the minimum evidentiary requirements in conspiracy cases."

The evidence amply supports the jury's verdict as regards Charlann Simon.

At the trial, the defendant Nightingale offered witnesses as to his good reputation in the community. Some of these witnesses were cross examined as to their knowledge of an incident wherein this defendant allegedly altered the writings on a check in order to obtain additional payments on a contract. These questions were asked to test the knowledge of the witness as to the good name of the defendant. Out of the hearing of the jury, the government established that the incident was known in the community and the question had a sound factual basis (Tr. pgs. 1127-1129). I instructed the jury regarding the limited purpose for which this question was permitted at the time of the questioning (Tr. pgs. 1134-1136) and also at the conclusion of the trial (Tr. pgs. 1978-1979). This procedure complies with the requirements set forth in Michelson v. United States, 335 U.S. 469 (1948).

In his brief and at oral argument, the defendant Stringi contended that the court erred in not inspecting the grand jury minutes for possible inconsistency in the testimony of a government witness, Elvin Cochran.

However, the record reveals that I did inspect the grand jury transcript without finding inconsistencies and denied the defendant's motion (Tr. pg. 1131). The procedure followed by me appears fully consistent with Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. United States, 360 U.S. 395 (1959) and United States v Boyance, 329 F. 2d 372, C.A. 3, 1964, cert. denied, sub nom. Feldman v. United States, 377 U.S. 965 (1964).

I have also considered the various other contentions raised by the defendants. These were denied in previous rulings and, in my opinion, are without merit.

The defendant's motions will be denied.

ORDER

AND NOW, TO-WIT, this 15th day of March 1966, for the reasons set forth in the foregoing Opinion, the defendants' motions for Judgment of Acquittal, New Trial and Arrest of Judgment are hereby denied.

LOUIS ROSENBERG,
United States District Judge.

cc: Counsel of Record

APPENDIX "B"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 15,975

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
v.
FRANK STRINGI, ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, JOSEPH HOROVITZ, SHARLANN S. SIMON, also known as CHARLANN MARIE SIMON, ELVIN E. COCHRAN, ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, Appellant

(D. C. Criminal No. 64-299)

On Appeal From the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania

Present:

KALODNER, HASTIE and VAN DUSEN, *Circuit Judges.*

JUDGMENT

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court, filed May 13, 1966, be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

ATTEST:
M. ELIZABETH FERGUSON
Chief Deputy Clerk

June 30, 1967

APPENDIX "C"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 15974
No. 15975

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
v.
FRANK STRINGI, ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, JOSEPH HOROVITZ, SHARLANN S. SIMON, ALSO KNOWN AS CHARLANN MARIE SIMON AND ELVIN E. COCHRAN.

FRANK STRINGI,
Appellant in No. 15974,

ERNEST NIGHTINGALE,
Appellant in No. 15975.

APPEALS FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Argued June 19, 1967

Before: KALODNER and HASTIE, *Circuit Judges*; and VAN DUSEN, *District Judge.*

OPINION OF THE COURT
(Filed June 30, 1967)

PER CURIAM:

The appellants have been tried and convicted on several substantive and conspiracy counts growing out of events which occurred during the winter and spring of 1963 in a small county of Pennsylvania. Each count involved some aspect or aspects of a series of transactions in which purported endorsements of owners of

United States Series E Savings Bonds were forged and, thereafter, the bonds were negotiated.

Over the appellants' objections all counts were tried together. In our view the offenses and the transactions charged were so related that the court's insistence that they be tried together did not constitute an abuse of discretion.

The appellants also complain that the court permitted the cross-examination of character witnesses as to whether they had heard that the defendant Nightingale, as to whose reputation for honesty they had testified, had asserted in an earlier civil case that certain writings were on a check at the time it was drawn when in fact, as subsequently proved, he himself had added the writing after the check had been cashed. The court below was satisfied by a government tender of proof, made in the absence of the jury, that the government could prove the occurrence of the derogatory transaction thus inquired about to impeach the testimony of good reputation. Moreover, two of the character witnesses admitted that they had or may have heard the derogatory information about the defendant. In these circumstances, we find no error in the inquiry made about any awareness to this matter in the cross-examination of the defense character witnesses.

The conviction and sentence of each defendant were proper and will be affirmed.

A True Copy:

Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

No. 423

ERNEST NIGHTINGALE AND FRANK STRINGI, PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions of the court of appeals (Pet. App. C) and of the district court (Pet. App. A) are not yet reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on June 30, 1967 (Pet. App. B). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on July 26, 1967. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the trial court erred in refusing to grant to two petitioners a separate trial as to each of a series

of transactions involving the forging and uttering of United States savings bonds.

RULES INVOLVED

The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provide:

> Rule 8: (a) *Joinder of Offenses.* Two or more offenses may be charged in the same indictment or information in a separate count for each offense if the offenses charged, whether felonies or misdemeanors or both, are of the same or similar character or are based on the same act or transaction or on two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or plan.
>
> (b) *Joinder of Defendants.* Two or more defendants may be charged in the same indictment or information if they are alleged to have participated in the same act or transaction or in the same series of acts or transactions constituting an offense or offenses. Such defendants may be charged in one or more counts together or separately and all of the defendants need not be charged in each count.
>
> Rule 14: If it appears that a defendant or the government is prejudiced by a joinder of offenses or of defendants in an indictment or information or by such joinder for trial together, the court may order an election or separate trials of counts, grant a severance of defendants or provide whatever other relief justice requires. * * *

STATEMENT

Following a jury trial in the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, petitioners Nightingale and Stringi were found guilty

under a multiple count indictment charging conspiracy and substantive offenses in the forging and uttering of three sets of United States savings bonds, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 495 (Stringi App. 3a, 6a–14a, 16a–31a).[1] On May 13, 1966, petitioners were committed, as authorized by 18 U.S.C. 4208(b), for the preparation of a study as a basis for determining the sentence to be imposed on counts 1 and 23. Imposition of sentence was suspended as to the other counts (Nightingale App. 62a; Stringi App. 46a). On appeal the convictions were affirmed.

Prior to the trial the court denied petitioners' motion for a separate trial with respect to each of the three sets of bonds (Stringi App. 33a–34a). This objection was later renewed in Nightingale's motion for acquittal, joined in by Stringi, and was overruled (Stringi App. 2a–3a, 35a).

The evidence may be summarized as follows:

1. Bonds registered in the name of Hammond were negotiated on February 26, 1963, at the First National Bank of Berlin, Pennsylvania, of which Nightingale was a director (App. 2b, 8b). Horovitz, whom both petitioners knew (App. 13b–15b, 19b), was induced by Stringi to forge Hammond's endorsement on the bonds and was introduced by Nightingale to bank officials, who cashed the bonds (App. 4b–9b, 17b–19b, 21b–22b). From the proceeds, $1,000 was received by Stringi and $26,254.40 was placed in the savings ac-

[1] "Stringi App." and "Nightingale App." refer to the appendices filed by the petitioners, respectively, in the court of appeals. "App." refers to the appendix of the appellee in that court.

count of Nationwide Construction Company, from which Stringi was authorized to make withdrawals (App. 10b–11b). Stringi paid Horovitz $500 (App. 22b).

2. Endorsements upon bonds registered in the name of Stofcheck were forged by codefendant Cochran, at the request of Stringi (App. 24b–28b, 30b). In an unsuccessful attempt to cash the bonds at a Rockwood bank, Nightingale introduced Cochran to a bank official as Mr. Stofcheck (App. 29b–30b). At the Berlin bank the bonds, totaling $9,409.37, were cashed on March 28, 1963 (App. 30b–31b). Nightingale directed a bank employee to put $3,000 of the proceeds in a joint checking account for Stringi and Nightingale. Nightingale received $1,000 in cash and a cashier's check in the amount of $5,409.37 for the balance (App. 31b). The following day Stringi gave this cashier's check to Cochran who cashed it, retained $1,000 for himself, and delivered the balance to Stringi (App. 31b–34b).

3. Bonds registered in the name of Stellitano were negotiated on May 9, 1963, at the Cambria Savings and Loan Association, Somerset, Pennsylvania (App. 40b). Stellitano's dorsement was forged on the bonds by Vento at the request of Nightingale who introduced Vento to a bank official as Stellitano (App. 38b–39b, 49b–51b). Nightingale directed the distribution of the $8,186.01 received for the bonds (App. 42b, 43b). The sum of $5,836.01 was deposited in a savings account in Stringi's name; $500 was deposited in Nightingale's savings account; a $500 money order

was given to Nightingale; and the remaining $1,350 was paid in cash to Vento (App. 42b–43b).

ARGUMENT

The court below did not err in refusing to grant petitioners' request for a severance. The charges arose out of a related series of transactions, were of a similar character, and constituted parts of a common scheme. All three transactions involved the forgery and uttering of United States savings bonds and occurred with a 3½ month period in the same rural area. A common *modus operandi* was employed, with Stringi obtaining the services of the forger, Nightingale being present at the banking institution to vouch for the spurious identity of the forger, and Nightingale and Stringi sharing in the proceeds of the bonds after paying part of the money to the forger. While there were additional co-conspirators as to each set of bonds, the two petitioners were involved in each of the transactions charged. Accordingly, under Rule 8, F.R. Crim. P., there was as to petitioners no misjoinder either of defendants or counts in the indictment. Furthermore, no prejudice warranting relief under Rule 14, F.R. Crim. P., was shown by petitioners. Petitioners' reliance on *McElroy* v. *United States*, 164 U.S. 76, is misplaced since in that case, unlike this, no count linked all the defendants. See *Schaffer* v. *United States*, 362 U.S. 511, 516.[2]

[2] Nor is there any conflict with the lower court cases cited by petitioners (see Pet. 6), all of which are distinguishable. In *Ingram* v. *United States*, 272 F. 2d 567 (C.A. 4); *Metheany* v. *United States*, 365 F. 2d 90 (C.A. 9); *Ward* v. *United States*, 289 F. 2d 877 (C.A. D.C.); *Cross* v. *United States*,

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated it is respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

THURGOOD MARSHALL,
Solictor General.

FRED M. VINSON, JR.,
Assistant Attorney General.

BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
ROBERT G. MAYSACK,
Attorneys.

AUGUST 1967.

---

335 F. 2d 987 (C.A. D.C.); and *King* v. *United States*, 355 F. 2d 700 (C.A. 1), the offenses improperly joined were in no way connected and were not part of the same series of transactions constituting the offenses charged. In *United States* v. *Spector*, 326 F. 2d 345, 350 (C.A. 7), where a conspiracy count had been joined with substantive counts, the acts concerning the alleged conspiracy had ended before those constituting the substantive offenses began.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1967

SUPREME COURT, U. S.
Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 18 1967
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

NO. 423

ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF

VINCENT M. CASEY, ESQ.
720 Grant Bldg.
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219

SMITH BROS. CO. INC., LAW PRINTERS, 620 SECOND AVENUE, PITTSBURGH, PA. 15219

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

NO. 423

ERNEST NIGHTINGALE, Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF

Petitioner's Reply Brief

The Government's Brief (Page 1) misstates the question presented. The important substantial error was in requiring petitioner Nightingale to stand trial with other defendants on three separate and distinct conspiracies, separate as to time and place, at one trial. There was no series of transactions as contemplated by Rule 8b of Criminal rules. The respondent was further in error in its statement of the case where it states the petitioner was found guilty under a multiple count indictment charging conspiracy and substantive offenses in the forging and uttering of three sets of United States Savings Bond. The petitioner calls the Court's attention to the fact that there were three separate and distinct conspiracy counts. The indictment did not charge a common scheme, but charged three different independent conspiracies.

The 23rd Count charges a conspiracy beginning February 26, 1963, as to the Hammond bonds. The 24th Count charges a separate conspiracy beginning March 28, 1963, as to the Stofcheck bonds. The 25th Count charges a separate conspiracy on May 10, 1963, relating to the Stellitano bonds. The Court charged the jury that three separate conspiracies were involved, (Nightingale App. 52a.)

The Government's argument that there was a common scheme is not borne out by the record. As stated above, there were three separate conspiracies with substantive counts relating to each separate conspiracy. The indictment did not allege a common scheme but separate transactions and the case was tried on the basis of separate transactions.

Petitioner relies on *McElroy v. U. S.*, 164 U.S. 76. That case is indistinguishable from the petitioner's case. The Government seeks to distinguish the McElroy case "upon the basis that there no count linked all the defendants."

In McElroy	*Petitioner's case*
No. 5332—McElroy, Bland, Henry Hook, Charles Hook, Stufflebeam, Jennings	23rd Count — Stringi, Nightingale, Simon & Horovitz
Assault with intent to kill Elizabeth Miller, April 16, 1894	Conspiracy to forge and utter Hammond bonds February 26, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.

In McElroy	*Petitioner's case*
No. 5333—McElroy, Bland, Henry Hook, Charles Hook, Stufflebeam, Jennings Assault with intent to kill Sherman Miller, April 16, 1894	1st Count—Stringi, Nightingale, and Horovitz Forging one Hammond Bond Feb. 26, 1963
	2nd Count—Stringi, Nightingale and Horovitz Uttering one Hammond Bond February 26, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
No. 5334—McElroy, Bland, Henry Hook, Charles Hook, Stufflebeam, Jennings Arson Eugene Miller House May 1, 1894	3rd Count—Stringi, Nightingale, and Horovitz Forging one Hammond bond February 26, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
No. 4843—McElroy, Bland, Henry Hook Arson of Bruce Miller House April 16, 1894	4th Count—Stringi, Nightingale and Horovitz Uttering one Hammond Bond at Berlin, Pa.
	5th Count—Stringi, Nightingale and Horovitz Forging one Hammond bond February 26, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
	6th Count—Stringi, Nightingale and Horovitz Uttering one Hammond Bond February 26, 1962, at Berlin, Pa.

In McElroy	*Petitioner's case*
	24th Count — Cochran, Stringi, Nightingale and Simon Conspiracy to forge and utter Stofcheck Bonds, March 28, 1963 at Berlin, Pa.
	7th Count—Stringi, Nightingale and Cochran Forging one Stofcheck Bond March 28, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
	8th Count—Stringi, Nightingale and Cochran Uttering one Stocheck Bond, March 28, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
	9th Count—Stringi, Nightingale, and Cochran Forging one Stofcheck Bond, March 28, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
	10th Count — Stringi, Nightingale and Cochran Uttering one Stofcheck Bond, March 28, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.

In Mc Elroy	*Petitioner's case*
	11th Count — Stringi, Nightingale and Cochran Forging one Stofcheck Bond, March 28, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
	12th Count — Stringi, Nightingale and Cochran Uttering one Stofcheck Bond, March 28, 1963, at Berlin, Pa.
	25th Count — Conspiracy Nightingale and Stringi, May 10, 1963, to forge and utter Stellitano Bonds, Somerset, Pa.
	15th, 16th, 17th and 18th Counts — Nightingale and Stringi Forging and uttering Stellitano Bonds, May 10, 1963, Somerset, Pa.

From the above, it is apparent therefore that in McElroy, the first, second and third counts linked all of the defendants.

Petitioner submits that all of the Court of Appeals cases cited by him are all in conflict with the decison of the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit All of petitioner's cited cases involve multiple defendants and separate transactions and are unconnected. The Government has lost sight of the fact that in petitioner's case,

there are three separate and distinct conspiracies charged and the jury's verdict indicates that each of the conspiracies were independent and unrelated.

The Government's Brief demonstrates the importance of the question involved and the confusion that exists in a single trial of multiple defendants on separate charges. Therefore for the reasons stated above as well as those stated in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, petitioner prays that his Petition for Certiorari be granted.

VINCENT M. CASEY
Attorney for Petitioner